



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

09/224696

APPLICATION NO. 96	FILING DATE 1/99	CROTTY	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
				BU9.97.226

WM02/1221
[KEVIN R. CASEY
RATNER & PRESTIA
ONE WESTLAKES BERWYN P O BOX 980
SUITE 301
VALLEY FORGE PA 19482-0980

EXAMINER
HARRISON, C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/224,696

Applicant(s)

Crotty et al.

Examiner

Chante' Harrison

Group Art Unit

2672

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 4, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☒ The drawing(s) filed on Jan 4, 1999 is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2672

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: FIG. 4. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the plurality of data values" in lines 6-7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The preceding rejection applies to claims 2
4. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. "A predetermined set of rules" is not clearly defined.

Art Unit: 2672

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golshani et al., U.S. Patent 5,774,128, 7/1998, 345/440 and further in view of Myers, U.S. Patent 5,581,677, 12/1996, 345/440.

As per independent claim 1, Golshani discloses generating a grid based on a plurality of data values (FIGS. 1, 3 & 7), associating each data value with a geometric shape according to a predetermined set of rules (col. 2, ll. 40-45), but fails to disclose placing the shapes on the grid, displaying visual and geometric information placed on the grid in graphical form which is disclosed by Myers (FIGS. 4 & 5). Myers also discloses associating data values with geometric shapes (col. 6, ll. 61-64), but fails to generate a grid of the data values. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the disclosures of Golshani and Myers because Myers teaches graphing geometric shapes representing data values and Golshani teaches drawing a relational graph using geometric shapes to identify objects and attributes and displaying the relationships in a grid.

As per independent claim 2, Myers discloses identifying a plurality of numerical attributes associated with each data value and associating each numerical attribute with a visual attribute

Art Unit: 2672

(col. 12-13, ll. 61-13) as does Golshani (FIG. 7; col. 3, ll. 10-27). The rejection as applied to claim 1 is included herein.

As per independent claim 3, Myers discloses extracting a plurality of data values from the geometric representation (col. 12-13, ll. 61-12) as does Golshani (FIG. 7; col. 10-27). The rejection as applied to claim 1 is included herein.

As per dependent claims 4, 8, 12 and 16, Golshani and Myers both fail to disclose a conductance matrix. However it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the teachings of Golshani (FIGS. 1-3) and Myers (FIGS. 3-9) because each graphically displays spreadsheet/database information, which is known to record any type of statistical or organized information.

As per independent claims 5 and 9, Golshani discloses a computer usable medium having code for implementing the method of claim 1 (col. 2, ll. 5-10, 42-46, 49-55) as does Myers (col. 11, ll. 12-23). Thus the rejection as applied to claim 1 is included herein.

As per independent claims 6 and 10, Golshani discloses a computer usable medium having code for implementing the method of claim 2 (col. 2, ll. 5-10, 42-46, 49-55) as does Myers (col. 11, ll. 12-23). Thus the rejection as applied to claim 2 is included herein.

Art Unit: 2672

As per independent claims 7 and 11, Golshani discloses a computer usable medium having code for implementing the method of claim 3 (col. 2, ll. 5-10, 42-46, 49-55) as does Myers (col. 11, ll. 12-23). Thus the rejection as applied to claim 3 is included herein.

As per independent claim 13, Golshani discloses a storage device having instructions for implementing the method of claim 1 (col. 2, ll. 5-10, 42-46, 49-55) as does Myers (col. 11, ll. 12-23). Thus the rejection as applied to claim 1 is included herein.

As per independent claims 14, Golshani discloses a storage device having instructions for implementing the method of claim 2 (col. 2, ll. 5-10, 42-46, 49-55) as does Myers (col. 11, ll. 12-23). Thus the rejection as applied to claim 2 is included herein.

As per independent claims 15, Golshani discloses a storage device having instructions for implementing the method of claim 3 (col. 2, ll. 5-10, 42-46, 49-55) as does Myers (col. 11, ll. 12-23). Thus the rejection as applied to claim 3 is included herein.

Art Unit: 2672

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Iannuzzi et al., U.S. Patent 5,586,052, 12/1996, 345/440X

Jordan et al., U.S. Patent 5,745,113, 4/1998, 345/440X

Art Unit: 2672

Conclusion

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

OR:

(703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chante' Harrison whose telephone number is (703) 305-3937. She can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Mike Razavi, can be reached on (703) 305-4713.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Chante' Harrison

December 6, 2000



**MATTHEW LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER**